



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,785	06/26/2003	Surendra N. Naidoo	4017-02807	6476

30652 7590 12/06/2005
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 GRANITE PARKWAY, SUITE 330
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/607,785	Applicant(s) NAIDOO ET AL.	
	Examiner Melur Ramakrishnaiah	Art Unit 2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-28,60-62 and 64-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-28,60-62 and 64-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 26, 27, 28, 60-62, 64, 65-70, 71-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325548A) in view of Nadooshan (US PAT: 6,161,182), Serbinis et al. (US PAT: 6,314,425, hereinafter Serbinis), DeStefano (US PAT: 6,275,227) and Katz (US PAT: 5,412,708).

Regarding claim 26, Nabavi discloses a method for remote monitoring of a premises, the method comprising: operatively coupling remote client (9, fig. 1) to a security system server (10, fig. 1), the security system server being capable of authenticating a user of the remote client, operatively coupling the remote client to a security gateway (reads on 1, fig. 1), the security gateway being capable of managing the monitoring of one or more portions of the premises, transferring information between the security gateway and the remote client, wherein the user at a location which is geographically remote from the premises, wherein access to the security gateway by the remote client is allowed based on the access permission for the user (figs. 1-3, page 6, line 3 – page 7, line 22).

Nabavi differs from claim 26 in that he does not teach the following: verifying the identity of remote client, transmitting authorization information from the security system server to the remote client and from the security system server to the security gateway,

Art Unit: 2643

the authorization information transmitted to the remote client including access token for the user, the remote client using the authorization information to operatively couple with the security gateway, wherein the access permissions for the user are based upon a permission profile created by a general administrator of the security gateway, wherein authorization information expires at a designated time and date; activating a signal at the premises for notifying the occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring.

However, Nadooshan teaches the following: verifying the identity of remote client, transmitting authorization information from the security system server to the remote client and from the security system server to the security gateway, the authorization information transmitted to the remote client including access token for the user, the remote client using the authorization information to operatively couple with the security gateway (fig. 9, col. 7, line 48 – col. 8, line 13; and fig. 1); and DeStefano teaches the following: the access permissions for the user are based upon a permission profile created by a general administrator of the security gateway (table 1: item 20); and Serbinis teaches the following: authorization information expires at a designated time and date (note: date and time are related, col. 21 lines 19-26); and Katz teaches the following: activating a signal at the premises for notifying the occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring (col. 10 lines 46-58).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Nabavi's system to provide for the following: verifying the identity of remote client, transmitting authorization information from the security system

Art Unit: 2643

server to the remote client and from the security system server to the security gateway, the authorization information transmitted to the remote client including access token for the user, the remote client using the authorization information to operatively couple with the security gateway as this arrangement would provide one of the ways, among many possible ways, of managing access to the secured system as taught by Nadooshan; wherein the access permissions for the user are based upon a permission profile created by a general administrator of the security gateway as this arrangement would provide well known means for administering access to secured resources as taught by DeStefano; wherein authorization information expires at a designated time and date as this arrangement would further refine the access arrangement to secured resources by limiting access to the secured resources by further criteria such as time based token access as taught by Serbinis ; activating a signal at the premises for notifying the occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring as this arrangement would provide initial notification to the affected users who are being video recorded so that any privacy concerns of affected users are addressed before commencement of video recording as taught by Katz.

Claims 27, 28, 60, 64, 71, are similar to claim 26 and they are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 26.

Nabavi differs from claims 61-62, 65-70, 72-74 in that he does not teach the following: time-based life span of the authorization information expires at/after a designated time and date subsequent to security system server transmitting the

Art Unit: 2643

authorization information to the remote client, life span of the authorization information is time based, authorization information is access token.

However, Nadooshan teaches the following: providing a access token to a user to access remote security gateway (145, figs. 1, 9), and Serbinis teaches the following: time-based life span of the authorization information expires at/after a designated time and date (note: date and time are related, col. 21 lines 19-26).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Nabavi's system to provide for the following: time-based life span of the authorization information expires at/after a designated time and date subsequent to security system server transmitting the authorization information to the remote client, life span of the authorization information is time based, authorization information is access token as this arrangement would provide one of the ways, among many possible ways, of managing access to the secured resources as taught by Nadooshan and Serbinis.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26-28, 60-62, 64-74 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

Art Unit: 2643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643